



One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL 60069
Ph: 847.883.8600 | Fax: 847.883.8608 | www.village.lincolnshire.il.us

**MINUTES OF THE
PARK BOARD MEETING
Monday August 17, 2015**

Approved September 21, 2015

Present: Ken Borgerding, Park Board Chairman
Lee Campbell
Kathy Alred Lin (arrived 7:02 p.m.)
Suzi Siegel (until 7:47p.m.)
Sandra Wright
Scott Pippen, Operations Superintendent

Absent: Lee Fell
Dan Hartman
Ted Heiser
Dr. Mara Grujanac, Trustee Liaison

Location: Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire Illinois 60069

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Borgerding called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2.0 ROLL CALL

Superintendent Pippen called roll and determined a quorum was present.

3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**3.1 Approval of the Minutes of the June 15, 2015 Meeting of the Park Board
(Village of Lincolnshire)**

The Park Board reviewed the minutes of the June 15, 2015 meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Ms. Wright, to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

4.0 RESIDENT COMMENTS AND REQUESTS

**4.1 Presentation from the Midwest Pesticide Action Center on Pesticide Free
Parks (Midwest Pesticide Action Center)**

Supt Pippen introduced Ruth Kerzee of the Midwest Pesticide Action Center. A Lincolnshire resident contacted the Village and asked that we look into pesticide free maintenance of the parks. This program would be a policy change so staff thought the program should be presented to the Park Board. Ms. Kerzee stated that the Midwest Pesticide Action Center (MPAC) is a 501c3 non-profit based in Chicago in existence for 20 years. Recently Evanston adopted a pilot program for pesticide free park maintenance. Spring Lake Park is considered as a starting place in part because of its swimming lake and proximity to the Des Plaines River. MPAC's plan suggested a vendor who provided a price quote for services. MPAC would promote the project, produce press releases, supply signage and provide information for residents. Ms Siegel asked how many seasons it would take to see if the program is effective. Ms. Kerzee said it would be 2-3 years before the full benefit would be seen.

Minutes of the August 17, 2015 Park Board Meeting

Page 2 of 5

Mr. Campbell noted that the informational packet provided shows in the second paragraph that Lincolnshire staff explained the current program and it was "noted as very responsible by MPAC". He asked Ms. Kerzee what if anything that the Village has done to this point has not been appropriate in her view. Ms. Kerzee responded that nothing that has been done is inappropriate. Mr. Campbell asked, in that case, why should we change? Ms. Kerzee responded that Spring Lake Park would be used as a showcase of what could be done using no pesticides. MPAC has not evaluated the Village's current maintenance program; however 27 of the 30 most commonly used pesticides have been shown to have an impact on public health, including asthma.

Ms. Wright asked if there had been a comparison including North Park which is maintained in a more natural way. Supt. Pippen provided a summary of the Village's current program. Broadleaf control and fertilization are contracted out with two applications done each year, one in the spring and one in the fall. The products used do not include 2-4-d or phosphorus. North Park is maintained by the Village and only treated with broadleaf control as needed and organic fertilizers. There are no blanket treatments in the Village. All treatments are done after evaluation and only when necessary. All staff doing in-house applications are licensed by the State of Illinois Dept. of Agriculture. Our current program is environmentally responsible. The program being considered would be more of a demonstration project for the community residents and also to promote tolerance in the community for some amount of weeds because of residential overuse of weed killing products.

If the Park Board were to decide to proceed with this type of program, the Village would have to follow State purchasing guidelines, not just use the vendor quote provided in the packet.

Ms. Wright asked if other communities in the area are participating in this program. Ms. Kerzee said that Glenview and Highland Park have had similar programs for a number of years. Evanston is in the second year of the program presented in the packet. Park Ridge has recently committed a park to pesticide free. Ms. Lin said she is in favor of the idea. The proposal is for one year, how would that show the result? Ms. Kerzee said that since the park is in pretty good shape it would be a good fit for education in just one year. The goal is to continue the maintenance beyond that first year. Ms. Kerzee stated that the term 'pesticide' is being used to include herbicides, fungicides, any '-cides' used to control an area.

Mr. Borgerding noted that the proposal includes line items for "weed management" in the spring and fall. What is that if not the application of herbicides? Ms. Kerzee said that the management is evaluation, and products such as liquid corn gluten, a natural weed control rather than a synthetic. The products used would be to strengthen the grass so that it can shade out the weeds. Ms. Siegel asked if there is any data from the participating communities that the program has reduced the use of chemicals in the home setting. Ms. Kerzee said she is not aware of any. Ms. Lin asked about outreach beyond the signage. Ms. Kerzee said MPAC could attend meetings, do social media, prepare press releases, and could design events in the park itself.

Ms. Seigel said she would like to see more data to see if it would be worthwhile. Will the program actually decrease the resident use of pesticides? Are the pesticides we are currently using already at a low level? Will the education program make a difference for

the community? Ms. Kerzee said it would be difficult to measure the impact. Ms. Seigel said it might be a better project for Rivershire Park. Ms. Lin said that the audience of Spring Lake is more new residents and preschoolers and it has more exposure in general so it would be a great place for this kind of program. Ms. Wright noted that pursuing the program would indicate that the issue matters to the Village. Signage could include the other measures the community takes to be environmentally sensitive.

Mr. Campbell said that more consideration is needed. He is hearing that the Village is doing a wonderful job and visits Spring Lake on a regular basis, several times a week for over 35 years. It is beautiful and not in need of improvement. Mr. Pippen noted that the lake is tested regularly by the Dept. of Public Health and has not had any reported issues. If the Park Board is interested, he could look into what other communities are doing. Is this something that Village staff could do without contractual assistance? He pointed out that the products to do this are not cheap. In our case it is really just tweaking our Best Management Practices, not a wholesale change in our program. Ms. Wright said it may just be a matter of educating the community and the public about what we do well already. We already have a network of ways to share that information. Ms. Seigel said Kudos to the Public Works staff for the good job they are doing now.

Mr. Pippen said he has done extensive training since the development of North Park. One concern he has with the proposed program is the possibility that our hands will be tied by an MPAC type of agreement if we need to treat, for example, a grub infestation. If there is Park Board interest in this type of a program he can do more research and come back with options for possible programs. Possibly the Village could do its own demonstration area without outside involvement. If funding is required we need to know during the budget process going on now.

Mr. Campbell asked what other for-profit agencies MPAC has a relationship with. Ms. Kerzee said they only want to connect interested communities with for-profit groups that can provide the services. Mr. Campbell pointed out that they appear to be recommending Greenwise based on the number of times they are listed in the program brochure. Ms. Kerzee said they were only asked to provide information since they have provided the service for Evanston. MPAC has no monetary connection with Greenwise.

Mr. Campbell asked about the approximate acreage of all park maintenance compared with the acreage at Spring Lake Park. Mr. Pippen said that the total maintained by the Village is approximately 350 acres and Spring Lake Park is slightly less than one acre. Mr. Campbell said that for \$10,000 we would be maintaining less than one acre. Mr. Pippen pointed out that the Greenview cost estimate is \$8,000 and the remainder is for signage. Signage expense is based on experience of other communities and the work could be done in-house. Staff time which is not included in the estimate would also be required. Some of the expenses are included in our current program but many are not.

Concerns were discussed about the possible take-over of weeds in one season and the possible reactions of residents. Mr. Pippen suggested that Rivershire Park might be a better starting area since the students are already talking about the impact of pesticides on water. If the natural maintenance plan didn't go as desired it would not be as noticeable. There isn't a lot of turf at Rivershire Park but the area at the corner of Lincolnshire Drive and Londonderry Lane could be a pilot area. Ms. Lin feels that if we want to raise awareness of the issue and make a difference, it should be a large enough

area to notice, and where people will see it.

Ms. Wright said that the agreement should be non-binding so that if a situation arises where we need to take extra care of the area we should be able to do so.

Memorial Park may be a good option since it has irrigation which is essential in a drought season like we have been having; also it is exposed to view on a busy intersection with bike paths on two sides. If a failure happened there it would not be so visible that it would have a huge impact or draw a lot of complaints.

Mr. Borgerding requested Mr. Pippen review the information available and see what could be done in-house and the impact on budget and staff.

5.0 RECREATION

5.1 None

6.0 PARKS

6.1 Consideration and Discussion of the 10 Year Capital Budget Plan for Parks and Paths, Facilities, and Equipment (Village of Lincolnshire)

Superintendent Pippen reviewed the draft budget spreadsheet provided to the Park Board. The plan has been reviewed by the Mayor and Board of Trustees and they have approved the overall concepts presented. The Park Board is invited to comment on the plan. The plan is a guideline and things can be moved around based on what is needed.

Mr. Campbell noted that the additional water slide installed this year at Spring Lake Park seems to have been a great success. It is getting a lot of use. Playground upgrades have recently been completed and are scheduled to begin again in 2020. Ms. Wright said that the newly redone Whytegate Park tennis court area looks phenomenal and it was busy non-stop this weekend in spite of the heat. Mr. Borgerding asked about the North Park netting. Mr. Pippen said that it is done now, until the netting needs replacement in approximately 7 to 8 years. The feedback about the netting has been good. People were worried that they would appear too large but the nets seem to blend in nicely. Safety-wise we have achieved our goal.

A motion was made by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Ms. Wright, as follows:

“The Park Board recommends to the Village Board the approval of the 10 Year Capital Budget Plan for Parks and Paths, Facilities, and Equipment.”

The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

7.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7.1 None

8.0 NEW BUSINESS

8.1 Updated Park Board Contact List Adding New Trustee Liaison Grujanac

(Village of Lincolnshire)

Unfortunately the contact list provided in the packet was still wrong. Mr. Pippen distributed paper copies of the correct list and can email them to anyone who would prefer a copy that way.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

9.1 A motion was made by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Ms. Wright, to adjourn the meeting. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote. Chairman Borgerding declared the meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.
